

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,166	12/19/2001	Thorsten Laux	30014200-1021 6148	
58328 SUN MICROS	7590 09/28/200 YSTEMS	7	EXAMINER	
C/O SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP			HU, JINSONG	
P.O. BOX 0610 WACKER DR	VE STATION, SEARS TOWER		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL		•	2154	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/025,166	LAUX ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jinsong Hu	2154			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise. 	action is non-final.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9,11-24 and 26-41 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-24 and 26-41 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Identified or b) objected to by the Identified or by the Ident	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Art Unit: 2154

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9, 11-24 and 26-41 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-9, 11-24 and 26-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simonson et al, "version augmented URIs for reference permanence via an Apache module design", from computer networks and ISDN systems 30 (1998), published on 1998.
- 4. Simonson is a prior art reference cited by applicant on form 1449, dated to 3/25/02.
- 5. As per claim 1, Simonson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a data processing system for sending a document with a network address to a recipient [abstract], the method comprising the steps of determining to send the document to the recipient [p. 342-343, all paragraphs under subtitle 4]; and sending the

AIT Offit. 2154

document with the incorporated network address to the recipient [p. 339-340, all paragraphs under subtitle 2; p. 340, paragraph 4 under subtitle 3].

Simonson also teaches incorporating a timer value or a calculated value based on the timer value, into the network address [p. 340-342, all paragraphs under subtitle 3]. Simonson does not specifically teach incorporating both a timer value and a calculated value into the network address at same time. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include both values in Simonson's system based upon the teaching of Simonson because doing so would benefit user by allowing them identifying a document in their convenience way.

- 6. As per claim 2, Simonson teaches the recipient is a computer [abstract].
- 7. As per claim 3, Simonson teaches the recipient is a program in the data processing system [p. 340, lines 10-12].
- 8. As per claim 4, Simonson teaches the calculated value is based on a time dependent increment [p. 340, lines 32-36, i.e., version number is a value calculated based on the time increment because the system needs the version number to determine outdated version and updated version].

Art Unit: 2154

9. As per claim 5, Simonson teaches the network address has a format such that a first part of the network address identifies a server in the network, and a second part of the network address identifies the document, which is sent by the server identified by the first part, and wherein the timer value is incorporated into the second part [p. 340, paragraphs 5-6 under subtitle 3].

- 10. As per claim 6, Simonson teaches the network address data has a format such that a first part of the network address data identifies a server in the network, and a second part of the network address data identifies the document, which is sent by the server identified by the first part, and wherein the timer value is incorporated into the second part [p. 340, paragraphs 5-6 under subtitle 3].
- 11. As per claim 7, Simonson teaches the network is the Internet and the network address is a Uniform Resource Locator [abstract].
- 12. As per claim 8, Simonson teaches the document is a web page and the network address is a URL [abstract].
- 13. As per claim 9, Simonson teaches the network is one of a Local Area Network, a Metropolitan Area Network and a Wide Area Network [abstract, lines 1-3].

Application/Control Number: 10/025,166

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claim 11, Simonson teaches of determining whether the network address comprises a link element, the link element having a format such that the link element can be used by a user of the network who receives a document containing the link element in order to generate a request containing the network address associated with the link element [p. 340, paragraph 3 under subtitle 3].

Page 5

- 15. As per claim 12, Simonson teaches the predetermined condition is met if the network address data comprises a link element, the link element having a format such that the link element can be used by a user of the network who receives a document containing the link element in order to generate a request containing the network address associated with the link element [p. 340, paragraph 3 under subtitle 3].
- 16. As per claim 13, Simonson teaches the step of receiving a request for the document, wherein the document is sent in response to the received request, the request comprising one of a network address identifying the document and an amended network address derived from a network address identifying the document [p. 340, paragraphs 4-5 under subtitle 3].
- 17. As per claim 14, Simonson teaches the steps of determining whether the received request comprises a network address or an amended network address; when the received request comprises an amended network address, deriving a network address from the amended network address by removing an address supplement from

the amended network address, the outputted document being identified by the derived network address [p. 340, paragraphs 4-5 under subtitle 3].

18. As per claim 15, Simonson teaches the invention as claimed including a method in a data processing system comprising a web server having a web page with a URL [abstract], the method comprising the steps performed by the web server of:

receiving a request to download the web page to a client [p. 339, second paragraph under subtitle 2];

determining whether the web page has been updated, when the web page has been updated, incorporating a time stamp into the URL of the web page [p. 342-343, all paragraphs under subtitle 4];

downloading the web page with the URL incorporated with the time stamp to the client to satisfy the request [p. 339-340, all paragraphs under subtitle 2]; and

when the web page has not been updated, downloading the web page to the client to satisfy the request [p. 339-340, all paragraphs under subtitle 2].

- 19. As per claim 16, since it is a computer program claim of claim 1, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 1 above.
- 20. As per claim 17, since it is a computer program claim of claim 2, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 2 above.

21. As per claim 18, since it is a computer program claim of claim 3, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 3 above.

- 22. As per claim 19, since it is a computer program claim of claim 4, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 4 above.
- 23. As per claim 20, since it is a computer program claim of claim 5, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 5 above.
- 24. As per claim 21, since it is a computer program claim of claim 6, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 6 above.
- 25. As per claim 22, since it is a computer program claim of claim 7, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 7 above.
- 26. As per claim 23, since it is a computer program claim of claim 8, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 8 above.
- 27. As per claim 24, since it is a computer program claim of claim 9, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 9 above.
- 28. As per claim 26, since it is a computer program claim of claim 11, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 11 above.

29. As per claim 27, since it is a computer program claim of claim 12, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 12 above.

- 30. As per claim 28, since it is a computer program claim of claim 13, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 13 above.
- 31. As per claim 29, since it is a computer program claim of claim 14, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 14 above.
- 32. As per claim 30, since it is a computer program claim of claim 15, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 15 above.
- 33. As per claim 31, since it is a system claim of claim 1, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 1 above.
- 34. As per claim 32, since it is a system claim of claim 2, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 2 above.
- 35. As per claim 33, since it is a system claim of claim 3, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 3 above.

36. As per claim 34, since it is a system claim of claim 7, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 7 above.

- 37. As per claim 35, since it is a system claim of claim 8, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 8 above.
- 38. As per claim 36, since it is a system claim of claim 9, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 9 above.
- 39. As per claim 37, since it is a system claim of claim 15, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 15 above.
- 40. As per claim 38, since it is a product claim of claim 1, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 1 above.
- 41. As per claim 39, since it is a product claim of claim 15, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 15 above.
- 42. As per claim 40, since it is an apparatus device claim of claim 1, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 1 above.

Art Unit: 2154

43. As per claim 41, since it is an apparatus device claim of claim 2, it is rejected for the same basis as claim 2 above.

Conclusion

- 44. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are not persuasive.
- 45. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that Simonson does not teach the step of incorporating both timer value and a calculated value in a web page address.
- 46. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks because applicant fails to consider the teaching of Simonson for incorporating a timer value or a calculated value based on the timer value, into the network address [p. 340-342, all paragraphs under subtitle 3]. Examiner also pointed out that Simonson does not teach the timer value and the calculated value will be shown on the web page address at same time. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include both values in Simonson's system because Simonson already taught both limitations, and the combination is simply add two known limitations together in Simonson's system without further teaching. Thus, the combination is not hindsight from the applicant's specification. Instead, the combinaiton is based on the logical reason, the teaching of Simonson and knowledge of one person with the ordinary skill in the art and it is implemented.

Accordingly, Simonson is still a relevant prior art reference.

Art Unit: 2154

47. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

- 48. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
- 49. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

September 24, 2007

NATHAM PLYNN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED